

Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Recovery Liability Act

In accordance with Departmental policy, 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that a proposed partial consent decree in *United States v. The Glidden Company, et al.*, Civil Action No. 5:95 CV 1009, was lodged on May 31, 1996 with the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio. This proposed consent decree would resolve the United States' claims against The Glidden Company, one of two defendants in this case, for unreimbursed past costs incurred at the Bohaty Drum Site in Medina County, Ohio, pursuant Section 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. 9607, in return for a payment of \$60,000.

The Department of Justice will receive, for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication, comments relating to the proposed consent decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General for the Environment and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530, and should refer to *United States v. The Glidden Company, et al.*, Civil Action No. 5:95 CV 1009, and the Department of Justice Reference No. 90-11-2-1108.

The proposed consent decree may be examined at the Office of the United States Attorney, Northern District of Ohio, 1800 Bank One Center, 600 Superior Avenue, East, Cleveland, Ohio, 44114-2600; the Region 5 Office of the Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois, 60604-3590; and at the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, N.W., 4th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005, 202-624-0892. A copy of the proposed consent decree may be obtained in person or by mail from the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, N.W., 4th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005. In requesting a copy, please refer to the referenced case and enclose a check in the amount of \$4.25 (25 cents per page reproduction costs), payable to the Consent Decree Library.

Bruce S. Gelber,

Deputy Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 96-14789 Filed 6-11-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-01-M

Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Pursuant to the Clean Water Act

In accordance with Departmental Policy, 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that a consent decree in *United States of America v. Rueth Builders, Inc.*, Civ. No. 2:96-CV-66 (N.D. Ind.), was lodged with the United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana on March 8, 1996. The proposed decree concerns alleged violations of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. 1311, as a result of the discharge of dredged and fill materials onto approximately 0.40 acres of wetlands by Rueth Buildings, Inc., in Dyer, Lake County, Indiana.

The Consent Decree provides for the payment of a \$10,000.00 civil penalty to the United States and permanently enjoins Rueth Builders, Inc. from taking any actions, or causing others to take any actions, which result in the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States, as defined by the Clean Water Act and regulations promulgated thereunder, except as in compliance with an individual permit issued pursuant to 33 U.S.C. 1344(a), or with any applicable general permit issued by the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

The Department of Justice will receive written comments relating to the consent decree for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this notice. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, United States Department of Justice, Attention: Steven E. Rusak, Trial Attorney, Environmental Defense Section, P.O. Box 23986, Washington, D.C. 20026-3986, and should refer to *United States of America v. Rueth Builders, Inc.*, DJ Reference No. 90-5-1-6-556.

The proposed consent decree may be examined at the Offices of the United States Attorney for the Northern District of Indiana, 507 State Street, Fourth Floor, Hammond, Indiana 46320; the office of Greg Carlson, Wetlands Enforcement Officer, Wetlands Division, Wetlands and Watershed Section, Wetlands Regulatory Unit, Region V of the United States Environmental Protection Agency, 77 W. Jackson Boulevard, 16th Floor, Chicago, Illinois, 60604, (312) 886-0124, and at the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, N.W., 4th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005. In requesting a copy, please enclose a check in the amount of \$2.75

for a copy of the consent decree with attachments.

Letitia J. Grishaw,

Chief, Environmental Defense Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division, United States Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 96-14796 Filed 6-11-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-01-M

Antitrust Division

United States v. A&L Mayer Associates, Inc., et al. No. 96-CV-40-44 (E.D. Pa., Filed May 30, 1996); Proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement

Notice is hereby given pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16 (b)-(h), that a proposed Final Consent Judgment, Stipulation and Competitive Impact Statement have been filed with the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania in the above-captioned case.

On May 30, 1996, the United States filed a civil antitrust Complaint to prevent and restrain A&L Mayer Associates, Inc., A&L Mayer, Inc. and Fibras Saltillo, S.A. de C.V., from conspiring to fix prices and allocate the sales volume of tampico fiber imported and sold in the United States in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. 1). Tampico fiber is a vegetable fiber grown in Mexico and used as a filler in industrial and consumer brushes.

The complaint alleges that the defendants agreed with unnamed co-conspirators to: (1) Fix the prices of tampico fiber imported into the United States; (2) fix the resale prices charged by their United States distributors; and (3) allocate tampico fiber sales between their distributors.

The proposed Final Judgment would prohibit the defendants from entering into any agreement or understanding with any other processor of tampico fiber or any of such processor's distributors for:

(1) Raising, fixing, or maintaining the price or other terms or conditions for the sale or supply of tampico fiber;

(2) Allocating sales volume, geographic markets or customers for tampico fiber;

(3) Taking concerted action to discourage or eliminate new entrants into the tampico fiber market; and

(4) Taking concerted action to restrict or eliminate the supply of tampico fiber to any customer.

The proposed Final Judgment would also prohibit the defendants from adhering to or adopting any resale